UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/823,145	04/13/2004	Peter J. Stromquist	M61.12-0628	4540

27366   7590   12/08/2008
WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
SUITE 1400
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3244

EXAMINER
IWARERE, OLUSEYE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3687	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 October 2008*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8 and 14-21* is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) *9-13* is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8 and 14-21* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *13 April 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/03/2008; 11/06/2007; 12/04/2006; 12/05/2005; 07/07/2004; 04/13/2004*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is a First Office Action Non-Final rejection on the merits. The

amendment to claim 1 has been entered. Claims 2 – 8 and 14 – 21 as originally filed

are currently pending and have been considered below.

Election/Restrictions

2.   Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1 – 8 and 14 – 21 in the reply filed

on 10/22/2008 is acknowledged.

3.   Claims 9 - 13 withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b)

as being drawn to a nonelected group II, there being no allowable generic or linking

claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on October 10, 2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
> matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
> conditions and requirements of this title.

5.   Claims 1-8 and 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed

invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-8 and 14-21 recite only a

nominal recitation of a computer system. Nominal recitations of structure in an

otherwise ineligible method fail to make the method a statutory process under section

101. Benson 409 U.S. at 71-72.   A general purpose computer is not a particular

machine, and thus innovative software processes are unpatentable if they are tied only

to a general purpose computer and an "incidental physical limitation, such as data

gathering, field of use limitations, and post-solution activity are not enough to convert an

abstract idea into a statutory process". Langemyr Appeal 2008-1495, p 20-21. The

only recitation of structure is in the nominal recitation in the preamble citing a "tangible

computer-readable medium of a computerized financial system" and "a computer

implemented method" . This recitation is so generic as to encompass any computing

system, such that anyone who performed this method or software process in practice

falls within the scope of the claims. The recitation of a computer system in the

preamble is not, in fact, a limitation for the scope of the claim, the claim is directed

essentially to the method/software process performed by any means.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 1 – 8 and 14 – 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over MaGuire (2004/0059651) in view of Gorelik (2001/0047372).

As per claims 1 and 14, MaGuire discloses in a computerized financial system,

a computer implemented method of configuring an Extraction, Transformation and

Loading (ETL) package for loading source data elements from a financial table of a

financial data store into a reporter table having pre-defined format, the method

comprising steps of:

a) forming one or more association objects each identifying one or more source

columns that are associated with a destination column of the reporter table ([0021] and

fig. 1 depicts forming association objects);

b) forming a transformation object defining a transformation of source data

elements of at least one of the source columns from a source format into a reporter

format of the associated destination column identified by the association object (fig. 1

and [0022] depict forming a transformation object via the conversion engine); and

c) generating instructions for configuring an ETL package to extract the source

data elements of the source column, transform the source data elements into the

reporter format in accordance with the transformation object, and load the transformed

source data elements into the associated destination columns of the reporter data table

in accordance with the association objects (fig. 1 and [0022] depict generating

instructions via the rules database).

However, MaGuire discloses a conversion engine and fails to explicitly disclose

ETL package.

Gorelik teaches a nested relational data model, with the feature of an ETC

system ([0006] discusses an ETL system).

From this teaching of Gorelik, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method of

MaGuire to include the ETL system taught by Gorelik, in order to provide means for

relation of data.

As per claims 2 and 15, MaGuire discloses, wherein the transformation includes

substituting at least a portion of the source data elements with a predefined substitution

element ([0036] and fig. 2C disclose substituting).

As per claims 3 and 16, MaGuire discloses, wherein the transformation includes

parsing the source data elements (fig. 2C and [0033] disclose parsing the elements).

As per claims 4, 5, 8, 17 and 18, MaGuire discloses the claimed invention but

fails to explicitly disclose wherein the transformation includes concatenating the source

data elements of two or more source columns, wherein the transformation includes

pivoting the source data elements of the source column and including an ETL generator

method configured to programmatically communicate with an ETL services module of a

server to configure an ETL package based on the destination, association, and

transformation objects.

Gorelik teaches a nested relational data model wherein the transformation

includes concatenating the source data elements of two or more source columns

([0122] discusses concatenating);

wherein the transformation includes pivoting the source data elements of the

source column ([0160] discusses pivoting); and

including an ETL generator method configured to programmatically communicate

with an ETL services module of a server to configure an ETL package based on the

destination, association, and transformation objects ([0006] discloses an ETL system).

From this teaching of Gorelik, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method of

MaGuire to include the concatenating, pivoting and ETL system taught by Gorelik, in

order to further provide means for relation of data.

As per claim 6, MaGuire discloses wherein the transformation and association

objects are each siblings of one of the destination column objects (fig. 2C depicts

destination column objects).

As per claim 7, MaGuire discloses wherein the destination column objects are

siblings of a destination table object defined by a destination table class (fig. 2C depicts

destination table class).

As per claim 19, MaGuire discloses wherein the forming step a) includes

receiving a user input defining the association of one or more source columns with a

predefined destination column ([0039] discusses user definition).

As per claim 20, MaGuire discloses wherein the forming step b) includes

receiving a user input selecting the transformation ([0022] discusses selecting).

As per claim 21, MaGuire discloses including a step of validating that an association object has been completed for each destination column of the reporter table prior to performing the generating step c) ([0031] discusses validation and completing).

Conclusion

8.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Collins (US 20020065744 A1), which teaches a Method for internet matching of user request to specific merchandise.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OLUSEYE IWARERE whose telephone number is (571)270-5112. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew S. Gart can be reached on (571)272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Matthew S Gart/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3687

OI